UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,890	09/16/2003	Jarl Sundqvist	1623	4513
20676 7590 07/12/2007 ALFRED J MANGELS			EXAMINER	
	4729 CORNELL ROAD CINCINNATI, OH 452412433		ROSENBAUM, MARK	
CINCINNATI,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,	•		3725	
·			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/663,890	SUNDQVIST, JARL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark Rosenbaum	3725
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 136(a). In no event, however, may a re I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	CATION. Sply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 /	-	
·—	s action is non-final.	and managed the second of
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under		•
	∟л рапе Quayle, 1900 C.D.	11, 400 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-16 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	n from consideration.	
	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:		119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority documen		
2. Certified copies of the priority documen3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority	-	· ———
 Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International Burea 		received in this National Stage
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		eceived
	to and doranted doplets flot (
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/16/03</u>. 	Paper No(s)	ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 9-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/9/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jensen et al in view of Brar et al. Jensen et al discloses the basic apparatus including
the use of a food processing component formed of nickel plated aluminum. There is no
mention of a dense outer surface formed by tumbling which may decrease the
component life. Brar et al solves this problem by disclosing similar apparatus including
the use of an aluminum component that has been tumbled to produce a desired outer
surface. In order to produce the desired outer surface, it would have been obvious for
one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Jensen et al by tumbling the aluminum
component to produce a desired outer surface, taught to be desirable by Brar et al. The
exact dimension of the coating would depend on several factors such as desired
component life.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) in view of Jensen et al and Brar et al. APA is the apparatus and its problems discussed in the first few pages of the specification. The problems include component surfaces that are not properly treated and end up contaminating the food. The combination of Jensen et al and Brar et al as set forth above solve these problems by disclosing the use of nickel plated aluminum in similar apparatus. In order to prevent material contamination, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify APA by using nickel plated aluminum components, taught to be desirable by the combination of Jensen et al and Brar et al. the remaining limitations would then have been obvious design choices only e.g. the exact dimension of the coating would depend on several factors such as desired component life.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Rosenbaum whose telephone number is 571-272-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/663,890

Art Unit: 3725

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Rosenbaum Primary Examiner Art Unit 3725

MR